



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
California Department of Water Resources



North Delta Improvements Project

Public Scoping Report

DRAFT 4/28/03

Date/Time: 1:30 to 4 p.m., February 20, 2003

Location: Bonderson Building
901 P Street
Sacramento, Calif.

The following project team members were in attendance:

Curt Schmutte – DWR
Gwen Knittweis – DWR
Collette Zemitis – DWR
Chris Kimball – DWR
Tom Hall – DWR
Joel Dudas – DWR
Ed Schmit – DWR
James Martin – DWR
Kent Nelson – DWR
Herb Hereth – DWR
Paul Bowers – USACE

Rebecca Wren – USACE
Bill Fleenor – UC Davis
Chris Hammersmark – UC Davis
Keith Whitener – The Nature Conservancy

Consultants:

Sam Garcia – Jones & Stokes
Don Trieu – MBK Engineers
Craig Moyle – Katz & Associates Inc.
Amber Williams – Katz & Associates Inc.

Local Community Attendees:

See Appendix C for scanned copies of original sign-in sheets. See Appendix B for documentation of public noticing.

Purpose

As part of its CEQA/NEPA compliance efforts, the North Delta Improvements Project program managers held two public meetings in February in Walnut Grove, Calif., and Sacramento, Calif. The purpose of the meetings was to receive comments from stakeholders and Agencies on integrated flood control and ecosystem restoration efforts in northern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, principally on and around Staten Island, Dead Horse Island, and McCormack Williamson Tract. This report represents comments, ideas and concerns presented at the Sacramento meeting.

Overview

The meeting opened at 1:30 p.m. with an open house, providing attendees the opportunity to review project information boards and talk one-on-one with subject-matter experts. The public comment session convened at approximately 2:15 p.m. Curt Schmutte welcomed the audience and provided an overview of the North Delta Improvements Project, its challenges, progress to date, as well as introduction of team members. Gwen Knittweis provided an overview of proposed North Delta Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration Improvements with assistance of a PowerPoint

presentation. Knittweis' presentation stated the reason for the meeting and gave a brief description of each work station. Work stations included flood control, ecosystem restoration, hydrology, hydraulic modeling, recreation, land use, and a general project overview. Project components such as flood impact, ecosystem restoration, and proposed solutions were also examined. The meeting was facilitated by Craig Moyle. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m. Oral comments were recorded on computer by Amber Williams. Written comments were provided by attendees on personal letter stock, public comment cards provided at the meeting, or on flip charts stationed near information booths.

Summary of Key Issues Discussed

Five issues and concerns were expressed during the public comment session, with dredging and CALFED as the most frequent at three comments. The remaining four were cost (2), and regulatory and science each receiving one comment. Listed below is a chronological account of public comments. See Appendix A for copies of all written comments received by the North Delta Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration Improvements Project.

Dredging

- One of many alternatives
- If this is a viable alternative CALFED should take the lead
- Analysis of dredge material

CALFED

- Project approval
- Sacramento County sharing costs
- Taking lead in terms of dredging as an option

Cost

- Explanation of project as if cost is a non-issue
- Sacramento County would like to share cost with CALFED

Regulatory

- No clear regulatory process

Science

- Desire for a science based solution

Public Comment Session

Facilitator: Asked for a show of hands regarding attendees' primary interest in project:

- Flood Control - majority
- Eco-System - few
- Recreation - very few

Mike Eaton, The Nature Conservancy:

Comment, when asked about dredging: Throw away tradition/assumptions and think outside the box to be successful. Thinks we need to look at dredging, among other potential solutions.

Margit Aramburu, Delta Protection Commission:

How are we going to be able to use the CALFED way to get a project approved? CALFED previously funded a project to analyze dredge materials but funds were low causing the project to be stymied.

Facilitator: What if money weren't an issue?

Response – Margit Aramburu:

Exceeded ambient levels, so didn't reflect the levels. *(Pending clarification)*

Attendee 3:

No clear regulatory process.

Follow-up – Margit Aramburu:

Sedimentation comes with storm water.

Question – Attendee 4:

Is this an issue that CALFED would take the lead on? Seems like CALFED should take the lead if, indeed, dredging looks like an answer.

Follow-up – Margit Aramburu:

We want a clear science solution that incorporates environmental sensitivity, flood control ... all the elements in harmony.

Statement – Craig Crouch, Sacramento County:

Would like to see Sacramento County project incorporated in the CALFED mission in a joint approach. People are concerned that Sacramento County is not environmentally sensitive. If costs are \$150 million, we want to be a part of this project and bring our \$13 million to the table. Quelling growth concerns together (Point Pleasant). The issue has changed dramatically with acquisition of Staten Island. Don't displace more flood-waters than are absolutely necessary. We want to see Department of Water Resources take the lead.

Response to Crouch – Mike Eaton:

This discussion should happen and we welcome Sacramento County's participation.

Written comments:

Public comment cards received at the Sacramento meeting included:

"I do not see reference to paleontological resources (fossils) in either the coping documents for this project or the PEIS/EIR. Have I missed it? CEQA checklist asks if the project would impact paleontological resources. Will the project specific EIS/EIR address impacts to paleontological resources?"

Dr. Lanny H. Fisk, PhD, RG
Paleo Resource Consultations
5325 Elkhorn Blvd., #294
Sacramento, CA 95842
916-339-9594, phone
Lanny@PaleoResource.com

“For flood control and fishery protection purposes consider the installation of a flow deflector at the confluence of Georgiana Sl. and the Mokelumne R. The deflector would redirect what is now an upstream flow vector to the Mokelumne R. to a down stream vector.”

John Winther
925-283-4216, phone

Anonymous public comments recorded on flip charts at the Sacramento meeting included:

“Use trip weirs at Staten & McCormack timed to take the peak off flood events.”